

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application.

Claims 1-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Natarajan et al. (USPN 6,584,502) (hereinafter “Natarajan”).

Claim 1 recites:

A method comprising:
 assigning a plurality of devices to a group;
 assigning at least one event-handling policy to the group, wherein the assigned policy is associated with each of the plurality of devices in the group; and
 evaluating a current state of each device before the assigned policy is applied to the device.

The Office Action argues that Natarajan discloses that “ADMIN and USER both can modify or change the policies” and that “changing includes assigning”. (See Office Action, page 6). Natarajan describes a technique for providing automatic event notification of changing network conditions to network elements in an adaptive, feedback-based data network. Natarajan discloses plug-in policy modules 254b-e in a policy engine 254. Natarajan also discloses that policy modules 254b-e may include multiple policies. (See Natarajan, Fig. 5C; col. 14, lines 33-67). However, Natarajan does not disclose or suggest assigning “devices” to the plug-in modules. Thus, even though Natarajan mentions modules having policies, Natarajan fails to disclose “assigning a plurality of devices to a group”, as recited in Claim 1.

The Office Action also argues that Fig. 17 in Natarajan “shows evaluating, re-evaluating, notifying and dynamically modifying the policy”. (Office Action, page 6). Fig. 17 is a flow diagram illustrating how the feedback-based network adapts to changing conditions resulted from a video conference. (See Natarajan, col. 29, line 60 to col. 32, lines 55). In Fig. 17, the method in Natarajan includes the evaluation of a policy. However, Natarajan does not disclose or suggest “evaluating a current state of each device before the assigned policy is applied to the device”, as recited in Claim 1. Thus, the disclosure of Natarajan differs from the recitation in Claim 1.

For the reasons stated above, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1 is not anticipated by Natarajan and is allowable. Given that Claims 2-9 depend from Claim 1, Claims 2-9 are also allowable for at least the same reasons.

Claim 10 recites:

An apparatus comprising:
a group of devices having an associated event-handling policy;
an event log configured to store event data; and
a management module coupled to the group of devices and the event log, wherein a current state of each device in the group of devices is evaluated by the management module before the event-handling policy is applied to the device.

As discussed above, although Natarajan discloses modules that include policies and the evaluation of those policies, Natarajan fails to disclose assigning devices to a group and evaluating a current state of each device in the group before applying a policy assigned to the group to the device. Thus, Natarajan fails to disclose the management module as recited in Claim 10.

Natarajan describes a data store for storing network control information. (See Natarajan, col. 12, lines 13-17). However, Natarajan fails to disclose an apparatus that includes the group of devices, the event log, and the management module, as recited in Claim 10.

For the reasons stated above, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 10 is not anticipated by Natarajan and is allowable. Given that Claims 11-17 depend from Claim 10, Claims 11-17 are also allowable for at least the same reasons.

Claims 18, as amended, recites:

One or more computer-readable media having stored thereon a computer program that, when executed by one or more processors, performs the process of:

- assigning a plurality of devices to a group;
- identifying an event-handling policy associated with the group of devices, wherein the event-handling policy defines how devices are configured;
- assigning the event-handling policy to the group of devices; and
- evaluating a current state of each device before the assigned event-handling policy is applied to the device.

Applicant submits that Natarajan fails to disclose the elements of amended Claim 18. In particular, Natarajan does not disclose “identifying an event-handling policy associated with the group of devices, wherein the event-handling policy defines how devices are configured”, as recited in amended Claim 18. Although Natarajan mentions modules having policies, Natarajan fails to disclose event-handling policies that define how devices are configured.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 18, as amended, is not anticipated by Natarajan and is allowable. Given that Claims 19-20 depend from Claim 18, Claims 19-20 are also allowable for at least the same reasons.


New Claims

Applicant submits that new claims 21-24 are allowable for at least the reasons discussed above.

Should any matter in this case remain unresolved, the undersigned attorney respectfully requests a telephone conference with the Examiner to resolve any such outstanding matter.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: 9-13-04

By: 
Steven R. Sponseller
Reg. No. 39,384
(509) 324- 9256 ext. 250